

# LIQUOR QUESTION IN HAWAII— THE PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED

(Continued from Page One.)

Remember, always, that the problem is not "how to abolish drinking"; but "how to reduce liquor drinking to the lowest practicable minimum."

## 1. THE REMOVAL OF OPPORTUNITY TO DRINK INTOXICATING LIQUORS IS THE MOST EFFICIENT MEANS OF REDUCING DRINKING TO A MINIMUM.

If all the liquor in the world was blotted out of existence, and no more was made, that would remove all opportunity to drink, and completely and effectively abolish drinking.

It is impossible to blot out liquor, so the next best thing must be done to "reduce drinking to the lowest practicable minimum."

If a man has to seek the opportunity to drink, he will be less likely to drink than he will if he is given the opportunity.

In other words, make it difficult to get liquor, and a man is less liable to drink than if it is easy to get it. The greater the difficulty, the less the liability.

"Out of sight, out of mind," applies as well to liquor as it does, as a rule, to other things.

### A BEEFSTEAK ILLUSTRATION.

Suppose a meat diet is injurious to a man who is fond of beef, and the doctor recommends cutting it out and substituting a vegetarian bill of fare. What would be the best method of securing the latter diet?

Would it be by broiling a delicious porterhouse steak to a luscious brown, putting it on a plate with a knife and fork and setting it on the table in front of that man when he was hungry, and allowing the appetizing flavors to waft over his longing palate; or by keeping the meat off the table and placing before him a liberal bill of fare of fruit and vegetables?

Is not the man more likely to eat that meat, cooked, savory and on the table, than he is if it is not there at all?

It may be said that if he eats the meat it indicates a weak character. This may or may not be so. That is "another story" to be considered later.

### STICK TO THE TEXT.

The question NOW under consideration is "how to reduce the drinking of intoxicating liquor to the least practicable minimum." Let us stick to the text.

### A COCKTAIL ILLUSTRATION.

Apply the above illustration of the meat eater, to the liquor drinker.

It is elemental that most men like liquor in some form; many crave it; a large number can not resist its lure. It is injurious to most men; deadly to a large percentage; nearly all would be better off without it.

Under these circumstances, what is the best method of cutting liquor out of a man's diet?

Is it by putting a cocktail under his nose, and letting its pungent and seductive flavor entice his appetite, especially with a lot of jolly companions present, administering punishment to other cocktails?

Is he not more likely to take a drink under such circumstances, than he is if no liquor is present?

### THE AVERAGE MAN.

If the man in the illustration is more liable to drink a cocktail, under the circumstances named, than if no liquor is present, equally certain is it that the generality of men are more likely to drink liquor if there is a convenient saloon at hand, than if there is no saloon.

The average man is more liable to drink if there is a saloon on the way home, than if he has to walk two blocks out of his way to reach one.

He is more liable to take a drink if he can reach a saloon by walking two blocks, than if he has to walk a mile.

He is more liable not to drink at all, if there is no saloon available.

### OPPORTUNITY THE CHIEF CAUSE OF DRINKING.

In other words, opportunity is the chief cause of yielding to temptation. Remove the opportunity and the temptation disappears. Diminish the temptation and the man drinks less frequently. Remove the temptation and the man does not drink.

Set the steak on the table and the man eats it. Remove the steak and as a rule the man no longer thinks of it and does not eat it.

Furnish cocktails and good company and the cocktail goes down red lane. No cocktail in sight, no cocktail is consumed.

Gridiron a man's pathway with saloons, with the odor of alcohol drifting across the sidewalk to his nostrils, and the friendly invitation to "come on, boys, and take a drink," with the sight of his companions accepting the invitation, and the most natural thing in the world is to go in and take a drink with them.

No saloon and the man, as a rule, will not think of liquor; but will go home and kiss his wife without paralyzing her with a whisky breath.

### CORRECTNESS OF THIS REASONING DEMONSTRATED.

The absolute correctness of the foregoing reasoning is demonstrated by the fact that everywhere, when whisky has become rampant and troublesome, and it is desired to bring it within bounds, the first thing done is to reduce the number of saloons. WHY?

There is only one reason; one answer: BECAUSE THE LESS SALOONS, THE LESS DRINKING.

Why the less saloons, the less drinking?

There is only one reason; one answer: BECAUSE THE LESS SALOONS, THE LESS OPPORTUNITY. THE LESS OPPORTUNITY, THE LESS TEMPTATION. THE LESS TEMPTATION, THE LESS YIELDING. THE LESS YIELDING, THE LESS LIQUOR DRUNK, AND THE ANSWER TO THE PROBLEM IS REACHED, viz:

THE WAY TO "REDUCE LIQUOR DRINKING TO THE LEAST PRACTICABLE MINIMUM" IS TO REDUCE THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR GETTING LIQUOR TO A MINIMUM—in other words, ABOLISH THE SALOONS.

### REASONING OF ANTIPROHIBITIONISTS LEADS TO SAME RESULT.

The reasoning of the antiprohibitionists themselves leads directly to this same result. Not the reasoning of the blind pig keeper and his twin brother, that brand of saloonkeeper who does not care what happens to the buyer and whose sole motive is to make money for himself; but the reasoning of those who agree with the prohibitionists that it is desirable to "reduce drinking to its lowest practicable minimum."

### THE ELEMENTS OF REGULATION AND HIGH LICENSE.

These conscientious antiprohibitionists say:

1. Restrict the sale of liquor by prohibiting its sale except to those who hold a license.

2. Issue only a few licenses.

3. Make the licenses high.

This they call "limiting the sale of liquor by regulation and high license."

### THE UNDERLYING PRINCIPLE OF REGULATION AND HIGH LICENSE.

What is the underlying principle involved in this interference with the

"natural right" of everybody to sell liquor?

Why will licensing improve the situation?

The reply is, that the underlying principle is simply, solely and only, that if everybody may sell liquor, there will be more "opportunity" to get it; and, there being more opportunity, more liquor will be drunk.

Why does limiting the number of saloons to a few, help to decrease drinking?

Simply, solely and only, because with many saloons there are many opportunities to drink. With few saloons, there are few opportunities, and consequently less liquor is drunk.

### WHY HIGH LICENSE HELPS DECREASE DRINKING.

Why does "high license" help to decrease drinking?

There are two reasons, viz:

First, because the higher the license, the fewer licenses will be issued; because more men can afford to take out licenses at \$100, than if the licenses cost \$1000 each.

There is no mysterious virtue in "high license." There is no secret reason why it reduces the consumption of liquor.

The patent, open and only reason is that, like prohibition, it reduces the number of places where liquor can be obtained.

In other words, it lessens the opportunities for getting liquor.

### ANOTHER REASON.

The second reason why high license lessens the consumption of liquor is, that it raises the price of drinks, so that a given sum of money buys less liquor.

If a man has only a dollar to spend, he can buy five drinks at 20 cents each; whereas he can buy ten drinks if they cost only 10 cents each. Consequently he can get only five drinks at the high price, instead of ten at the low price, and high license has reduced that man's consumption by one-half.

In other words, it has reduced his "opportunity" for drinking, by lessening the purchasing power of his money.

### NO DIFFERENCE IN PRINCIPLE BETWEEN HIGH LICENSE AND PROHIBITION.

There is, therefore, no difference in the principle involved between high license and prohibition. There is only a difference in degree.

High license lessens drinking by lessening the opportunities to drink; but still leaves some saloons; in other words, some opportunities.

The prohibitionist argues that, if lessening opportunities lessens drinking, and lessening drinking is the object sought, then why leave any opportunities which can be removed?

If abolishing SOME saloons lessens drinking, then why not abolish ALL the saloons and lessen drinking still more?

### HIGH LICENSE FROM ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW.

In other words, high license advocates admit the principle that reduction in opportunities to drink lessens drinking. They then proceed to prohibit all men from selling liquor except those who hold a license. Then they arbitrarily reduce the number of licenses to a few, so that many who would like to engage in the business are unable to do so. They then arbitrarily and intentionally put the price of a license so high that still fewer can afford to hold one, on the one hand; and, on the other hand, raise the price of liquor so high that the "poor man" can get less liquor for his money.

### INTERFERENCES WITH LIBERTY.

In the face of all these arbitrary "interferences with liberty," they roll their eyes to heaven and condemn the prohibitionists for interfering with the "freedom" of mankind. They declaim, with patriotic virtue, that they would "rather be free than sober." They scornfully refer to "Puritans" and thank God that they are not as other men are, while all the time they are working along exactly the same lines that the prohibitionists are working, viz: Legislating in such manner as to deprive the great majority of citizens of their "natural right" to sell and drink liquor freely, with the object of "reducing the drinking of liquor to its lowest practicable minimum," by reducing the opportunities to get it.

### DIFFERENCE NOT IN PRINCIPLE BUT IN DEGREE.

The difference between high license and prohibition is not in principle, but in degree.

The high license advocate stops half way. He would only remove a part of the opportunities—a part of the saloons.

The prohibitionist follows the principle to its logical conclusion, and advocates the removal of other opportunities—the remaining saloons.

The high licenser "sends a boy when a man is needed," and trumps with a two spot, the second hand around.

The prohibitionist proposes to play the game by tramping with a high card. The prohibitionist proposes to guard the barn with a bulldog. The high licenser with a puppy. Both choose the same means. The difference is that the dog is more efficient than the pup.

The one digs up the noxious plant by the roots and destroys the evil fruit. The other prunes some of the branches and leaves the remainder to produce their kind.

The one secures results; the other plays at reform and accomplishes little.

### BLIND PIGS.

But, says the antiprohibitionist, in reply to the foregoing, abolishing saloons does not abolish opportunity and temptation. The blind pigs take their place.

The reply to this objection is, that no one claims that abolishing the saloon will abolish drinking. That condition will obtain only when the millennium arrives.

### REMEMBER THE TEXT.

Remember the text; the problem is not "how to abolish liquor drinking"; but "how to reduce drinking to the least practicable minimum."

The conscientious antiprohibitionists admit that the less the number of saloons the less the drinking; that is, the less the opportunity to drink, the less the amount drunk; otherwise why do they advocate limiting the number of saloons?

By the same process of reasoning, a saloon openly located on the public street, selling under protection of the law and the police, gives more opportunity—is a greater temptation to drink, than is a secret blind pig in a back alley, under the ban of the law and in fear of the police.

In other words, the fewer the saloons the less opportunity. But any lawful public saloon affords more opportunity to drink than does an outlawed place of sale, requiring concealment as a price of its existence.

Consequently, the fact that blind pigs will exist under prohibition, even in the same numbers that they now exist under regulation, does not negative the reasoning that prohibition of the saloon will "reduce the drinking of liquor to its lowest practicable minimum."

## DIAZ ELECTED PRESIDENT AGAIN

MEXICO CITY, June 27.—President Porfirio Diaz is reelected president of the republic of Mexico and Ramon Corral vice-president by an overwhelming majority. Notwithstanding their prediction boasts, the opponents of President Diaz polled only about two per cent of the total vote.

Much threatening talk was heard prior to election day, but it all came to nothing. The balloting throughout the country took place quietly, and there were no demonstrations of a threatening character.

Porfirio Diaz has been president of Mexico ever since his first election in 1877, and this reelection probably insures his remaining at the head of the government the rest of his life, as he is now nearly eighty years old. He was born September 20, 1820.

### HONOKAA CROP.

Latest official estimates of the yield of Honokaa this year places the total at 10,000 tons, says the Kohala Midget. This is 1000 tons below the estimate of the manager, Mr. Gjerdrum, last January. The cause of the shortage is the long drought. There will be no decrease in the dividend.

## THREE DEAD IN STEAMBOAT FIRE

LACROSSE, Wisconsin, June 27.—Three are dead and more than sixty injured as a result of the fire that destroyed the Mississippi packet last Friday. Hundreds were prevented from jumping into the river to escape the flames by the bravery and coolness of the crew of the steamboat. Panic prevailed on board the vessel for a time, but it was finally quieted, though not until three had been killed and many others injured in the wild scramble to escape death.

### THE ANNOYING COUGH.

Your cough annoys you. Keep on hacking and tearing the delicate membranes of your throat if you want to be annoyed. But if you want relief, want to be cured, take Chamberlain's Cough Remedy. For sale by all druggists. Benson, Smith & Co., Ltd., agents for Hawaii.

W. M. Bray, who was connected with the Hopp Furniture Company here until a short time ago, is reported to be in charge of a furniture store in Los Angeles. Mr. Bray's connection with the Hopp company was disastrous to its owners and the new manager, L. Ables, is engaged in straightening out its tangled affairs.

# THE RAILROADS MUST BE GOOD

Or the Interstate Commerce  
Commission Will Get  
Them.

## THE RATE INCREASE BLOCKED

President and Congress Have  
Been Busy With Very  
Good Results.

By Ernest G. Walker.

(Mail Special to The Advertiser.)

WASHINGTON, June 13.—These are big railroad days—big railroad days in congress, where the prime consideration just at present is the conference report on the railroad bill, big railroad days at the White House offices where the President has been holding historic talks with the officials of great transportation systems and exacting terms. So much so that line has already been done during the last few days that much of it is being passed over without particular emphasis during the rush and hurry of a legislative June.

The injunction proceedings against the Western Traffic Association, affecting twenty-four roads between Missouri River and Mississippi River points, were begun with great flourish on the last day of May and were regarded of such importance that for a time they filled the public eye. But that suit is now far in retrospect because of subsequent happenings which overshadowed it. There is plainly to be a big rise in freight rates nearly the whole country over, unless—Here is where the important part comes in. The "unless" has to do with the interstate commerce commission and the new railroad bill, to which profound writers of law are putting the finishing touches.

The railroads disclaim any untoward intentions in filing their rate increases. Under the present law such rates must be filed thirty days before becoming effective. The twenty-four western railroads had filed many increases to become effective June 1 but were restrained by what came to be termed the midnight injunction that Attorney-General Wickersham obtained at Hannibal, Missouri, from District Judge David P. Dyer. Many other increases in freight rates have also been filed from different parts of the country but the bulk of them do not take effect till after July 1, by which time it is expected the new railroad law, giving the interstate commerce commission larger powers of investigation, will be in operation.

However, it was claimed that the railroads were hurrying to file their rate increases and to have the same effective before the new law went into operation. That claim was the basis of the remarkable activities of the administration covering several recent days. First of all it should be told how a committee of railroad presidents, representing the twenty-four western lines, promptly came to Washington. They were S. M. Felton, president of the Chicago and Great Western; Frederick P. Delano, president of the Wabash, and P. P. Ripley, president of the Atchafalpa, Topeka and Santa Fe. The upshot of a four-hours' talk at the White House offices with President Taft was an agreement to withdraw the increase, which, as a matter of fact, covered only about one-half of one per cent of the tonnage carried by the twenty-four western railroads between Missouri and Mississippi River points. And in return the President and Attorney-General Wickersham agreed to withdraw the injunction proceedings before the district court at Hannibal, Missouri. This was only preliminary.

The railroad officials intend to file these increases anew and also to file many more increases—increases covering about fifteen per cent of their tonnage. But they will not do this till after the new railroad law has gone into operation so that the interstate commerce commission may have all the advantages of that law in taking up those increases and determining whether they are just and reasonable. And right after the conference with the western railroad officials there came to Washington President W. C. Brown of the New York Central and President James McKee of the Pennsylvania. They had a talk of about an hour's duration with the President, during which it was agreed that those roads and in fact all the eastern roads should not put any rate increases into operation till after the new railroad law had gone into effect. The agreement covers practically all the railroads of the country. The administration in reality has not yet withdrawn the injunction proceedings in Missouri and will not do so till after the new law is actually in operation, but the agreement stands nevertheless.

Railroads in all sections of the country intend to increase their rates for hauling interstate freight and it is only a question of a few weeks before the interstate commerce commission will be in the midst of a very big task in determining whether those rates shall stand. It may all lead to a big battle, although there is an impression that the whole matter will be settled amicably. The interstate commerce commission, who usually adjourn about July 1 for the summer are preparing to tackle the job energetically.

The advantages which the commission will have under the new law in

finding out whether the new rates are just and reasonable should be referred to in some detail. As the existing law reads, the commission can not originate inquiry into the reasonableness of any railroad rate. They can act only on complaint filed by shippers or other interested parties. The new law, which is being finished in conference, gives the commission authority to originate investigations, without regard to complaints by shippers, and also authorizes them to suspend such rates for a considerable period of time. The new act, as it passed the senate, allows increases in rates to be suspended for 120 days, while the commission are conducting an investigation and then, in their discretion, for six months longer. The duration of suspension will at least be 120 days in the new law. That is a power the commission have never had before and it is regarded as very important in the present controversy.

There will be a big batch of filings about July 1 and the commission will then be able under the new law to say whether these increases shall continue in force while the reasonableness of such increases is being investigated. It is understood that the commission will probably suspend such of the increases as promise to affect materially the towns and cities to which they apply. Where the increases are of comparatively minor importance, the commission will not suspend them. The outcome of the inquiry will be watched with keen interest, for it is the most important undertaking in the history of government regulation of interstate transportation. The new law will also contain several other provisions facilitating the inquiry. Among other things it will probably place a larger burden of proof upon the railroads than has ever before been required.

Right at the heels of the White House talks with railroad presidents and the agreements resulting therefrom came a nice little combat between the senate and the house over the enactment of the new law. The house had passed its railroad bill several weeks ago. The senate passed its railroad bill just before the talks were held with the railroad presidents. On the supposition that the bill would go into conference the senate leaders accepted a number of rather radical amendments with the intention of dropping those amendments in conference. Thus they avoided some debate and contention. The Democrats and insurgents in the house promptly started a campaign for the acceptance of the senate bill just as it stood. A motion to recommit and censure has high privilege. The President wanted a provision allowing the law to become immediately operative instead of in 60 days as both the senate and the house had provided. The motion to recommit and censure was made in the house, with a proviso that the law should come into effect at once. The regulars made a spectacular fight to send the bill to conference and they won in the house by a vote of 162 to 156.

Four Tammany Democrats and two Democrats from Alabama saved their bacon for them. These six voted for a conference. There has been a lively struggle in conference, where the Republican conferees are all regulars. The next interesting chapter will come after these conferees have made their report as they are expected to do before the end of the week.

## NOBODY SPARED

Kidney Troubles Attack Honolulu Men and Women, Old and Young.

Kidney ills seize young and old. Come quickly with little warning. Children suffer in their early years—Can't control the kidney secretions. Girls are languid, nervous, suffer pain. Women worry, can't do daily work. Men have lame and aching backs. The cure for man, woman or child. Is to cure the cause—the kidneys. Doan's Kidney Pills cure sick kidneys—

Cure all forms of kidney suffering. Honolulu testimony proves it. B. T. White, Pearl City, Oahu, Honolulu, Hawaii, says: "I am ninety-two years of age and I suffered from headache and kidney disease for eight years. I have given Doan's Backache Kidney Pills a fair trial and have been so greatly benefited that I cheerfully recommend them to other kidney sufferers."

Doan's Backache Kidney Pills are sold by all druggists and storekeepers at 50 cents per box (six boxes \$2.50) or will be mailed on receipt of price by the Hollister Drug Co., Honolulu, wholesale agents for the Hawaiian Islands. Remember the name, Doan's, and take no substitute.

## AUSTRIANS ARE USING PINES OF HAWAII

European manufacturers of glass candies and confections which require the highest confectioner's art, are calling for the Hawaiian pineapple to put into their goods. The promotion committee recently received a letter from Mabel Wing Castle telling of her visit to the famous confectioners in southern France where she learned he used the Hawaiian pineapple exclusively for his glass goods.

Yesterday, the Hawaii Promotion Committee received a letter from I. Boehm, who conducts the "Amerian Depot" in Vienna, or Wien, as the Austrians spell it, asking for particulars about the Hawaiian pine. He said: "I bought pineapples until now in Singapore. Having learned that in Hawaii, also, pineapples are preserved in time, as well as wholes and cubes, I would like to enter into business relations with you directly, and I wish you would give me quotations."

"I am interested in 3 lb. and 3 1/2 lb. tins, whole uncored; 3 lb. tins, chunks; and 6 lb. tins regular cut cubes, each kind in its own juice and of best quality."

The Austrian ministers of finance are advising measures to protect the petroleum industry.

Dr. J. Collis Browne's

**Chlorodyne**

The ORIGINAL and ONLY GENUINE.

The Best Remedy Known for

COUGHS, COLDS,

ASTHMA,

BRONCHITIS.

Acts like a Charm to

DIARRHOEA, DYSENTERY, & CHOLERA.

Concentrated Medical Expertise with each Bottle.

Sold in Bottles by all Chemists. Price in Bottles, 1/11, 2/6, 4/6.

The Most Valuable Remedy

ever discovered.

Effectually cuts short all attacks

of SPASMS, Checks and arrests

these too often fatal diseases—

FEVER, CRUP, AGUE.

The only Palliative in

NEURALGIA, GOUT,

RHEUMATISM, TOOTHACHE.

See Manufacturers.

J. J. DAVENPORT, Ltd., London, S.E.